Filed 10/30/2007

Page 1 of 7

Case 3:07-cv-03629-CRB Document 30

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP

1	
2	

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17

16

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25 26

27

28

///

Plaintiff RICHARD TRAVERSO and Defendant CLEAR CHANNEL OUTDOOR, INC. submit the following Joint Case Management Statement and Proposed Order:

- 1. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Jurisdiction and Service. plaintiff's claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b). No issues exist regarding personal iurisdiction or venue. All parties have been served.
- 2. Facts. Plaintiff is a lessor (through assignment) and Defendant is a lessee (also through assignment) under a commercial lease agreement effective May 1, 1984 ("Lease"). The Lease is for erecting and maintaining advertising signs at 650-660 Bryant Street in San Francisco, California ("Property"). Plaintiff contends that the Lease, which was originally for a term of five years (with an automatic rollover provision of a like term if not terminated), was subsequently extended by letter agreements to February 28, 2007. Plaintiff contends that on December 22, 2006, Plaintiff served Defendant with a notice of termination of the Lease. Plaintiff contends that Defendant has refused to vacate the Property. On June 4, 2007, Plaintiff filed an unlawful detainer action in the San Francisco Superior Court. On July 13, 2007, Defendant removed the action to this Court.
- 3. Legal Issues. Plaintiff contends that it is entitled to immediate possession of the Property and back rent for the fair rental value of the Property. Defendant contends that Plaintiff's notice of termination was defective, that it is entitled to retain possession of the Property, and that the terms of the current Lease apply including the provisions regarding rent.
- 4. Motions. On August 8, 2007, Defendant filed a Motion to Dismiss which was denied by the Court on October 12, 2007. On September 20, 2007, Plaintiff filed a Motion for Relief From Case Management Schedule which was denied by the Court on October 26, 2007. Plaintiff intends to file a motion for summary judgment. Defendant may move for summary judgment.
  - 5. Amendment of Pleadings. Plaintiff does not intend to amend his complaint.
- 6. Evidence Preservation. The parties have agreed to preserve all evidence relevant to the issues reasonably evident in this action.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

7.	<u>Disclosures</u> .	On October	9, 2007,	Defendant	served	its initial	disclosures	unde
Federal Rules	of Civil Proced	ure 26(A)(1).	Plaintiff	will serve i	its initial	disclosur	es by the de	adline
set forth under	Federal Rules	of Civil Proce	edure 260	<b>A</b> )(1).				

- Discovery. No discovery has been undertaken to date. The parties anticipate that 8. their discovery will generally consist of requests for production of documents and depositions.
  - 9. Class Actions. This is not a class action.
- Related Cases. There are no related cases or proceedings pending before another 10. judge of this Court, or before another court or administrative body.
- Relief. Plaintiff seeks immediate possession of the Property and back rent for the 11. fair rental value of the Property. At present, Plaintiff seeks approximately \$270,000 based on the fair rental value of the Property. Defendant believes that Plaintiff's damages, if any, should be limited to the rent set forth under the Lease.
- The parties are currently in informal settlement 12. Settlement and ADR. discussions. The parties are amenable to mediation.
- Consent to Magistrate Judge for all Purposes. On July 18, 2007, Defendant 13. filed a Declination to Proceed Before Magistrate Judge.
- 14. Other References. This action is not suitable for reference to binding arbitration, a special master, or the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation.
- Narrowing of Issues. At present the parties are unaware of any issues that can be 15. narrowed by agreement or by motion and do not request the bifurcation of any issues, claims, or defenses. Plaintiff believes that the presentation of evidence at trial can be expedited through stipulated facts.
- Expedited Schedule. Plaintiff believes that this action should proceed on an 16. expedited basis.
- Scheduling. The parties only recently received the Court's order on Plaintiff's 17. Motion for Relief of Case Management Schedule and have not had an opportunity to propose dates for the designation of experts, discovery cutoff, hearing of dispositive motions, pretrial conference, or trial.

Document 30

Filed 10/30/2007

Page 4 of 7

Case 3:07-cv-03629-CRB

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP 1111 Broadway, 24th Floor Oakland, CA 94607-4036

014965.0001\827125.1

## **CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**

The Joint Case Management Statement and Proposed Order is hereby adopted by the Court as the Case Management Order for the case and the parties are ordered to comply with this Order. Plaintiff is ordered to serve a copy of this Order on any parties subsequently joined in this action.

> Martin J. Jenkins United States District Judge

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean LLP 1111 Broadway, 24th Floor Oakland, CA 94607-4036

20

21

2223

24

25

2627

28

014965.0001\828986.1